DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 005 TM 030 803

AUTHOR Hansen, David T.
TITLE Dewey and the Contours of an Environment for Teaching and Learning.
PUB DATE 2000-04-25
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Environment; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Learning; *Teacher Role; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Dewey (John)

ABSTRACT

The philosophical anthropology of John Dewey supported his organic picture of democratic life. This paper examines how Dewey's philosophical anthropology informed his conception of the educational environment, with emphasis on Dewey's understanding of how teachers can influence students through the intermediary of the environment. All teaching, Dewey contended, occurs through the medium of the environment of the school and classroom. The environment for successful learning should be simplified, purified, balanced, and steadying. The teacher can best promote learning by working out situations that draw on and extend students' knowledge, insight, curiosity, and more. The educational environment changes with the persons embedded in it, and that includes the teacher. Dewey's perspective on the environment remains timely for teachers and teacher educators. (Contains 18 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

D. Hansen

1

Dewey and the Contours of an Environment for Teaching and Learning

by

David T. Hansen
University of Illinois at Chicago
College of Education (m/c 147)
1040 W. Harrison Street
Chicago, IL 60607-7133

dhansen@uic.edu

TM030803

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 25, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dewey and the Contours of an Environment for Teaching and Learning

David T. Hansen
University of Illinois at Chicago

John Dewey's conception of the educational environment has its origins in at least two closely related sources: his vision of democracy, and his philosophical anthropology. For Dewey, democracy describes a form of associated life, rather than solely a set of governmental institutions or laws (cf. Dewey, 1997, pp. 83-88). Democracy is a name for a mode of life in which persons habitually keep in view the interests, the concerns, and the aspirations of others, even as they attend to their own. Dewey believes the environment in the school and classroom should promote such a mode of life by enabling teachers and students to enact it day by day, even moment by moment. Such a mode, according to Dewey, fuels the growth of both individuals and society.

Dewey's philosophical anthropology supports his organic picture of democratic life. In Democracy and Education, which Dewey regarded as his most comprehensive statement about education, he gives his anthropology first billing. Chapters One through Six of the book build to his conception of human personhood, which he captures in his familiar, dynamic notion of growth. The idea of growth provides the context for his view of democracy, which he formally introduces in Chapter Seven. In this paper, I will focus on the initial phase of Dewey's analytical sequence. I will examine how his philosophical anthropology informs his conception of the educational environment. In particular, I will highlight Dewey's understanding of how teachers can influence students, through the intermediary of the environment, for the better rather than for the worse.

Person and World

Dewey juxtaposes a dynamic, normative conception of the self, with an equally dynamic, context-based view of how persons influence one another. For Dewey, person and world are deeply interconnected. "Life activities flourish or fail only in connection with changes of the environment," he argues.

> They are literally bound up with these changes; our desires, emotions, and affections are but various ways in which our doings are tied up with the doings of things and persons about us. Instead of marking off a purely personal or subjective realm, separated from the objective and impersonal, they indicate the non-existence of such a separate world. They afford convincing evidence that changes in things are not alien to the activities of a self, and that the career and welfare of the self are bound up with the movement of persons and things. Interest, concern, mean that self and world are engaged with each other in a developing situation. (1997, pp. 125-126)

Human beings become what they do, think, worry about, attend to, feel, and so forth. In a literal sense, or so Dewey argues, individuals "lose" their selves in what they take an interest in; but, at the same time, they "find" their selves in those very same interests (Dewey, 1997, pp. 126, 351-352). Posed differently, their selfhood is not fixed, ready-made, or fated to a particular destiny -- at least if they are growing, i.e., if they have retained the all-important quality of plasticity. Plasticity is "the ability to learn from experience; the power to retain from one experience something which is of avail in coping with the difficulties of a later situation" (1997, p. 44).

The normative dimension of Dewey's view of the self emerges through the doorway

provided by the concept of plasticity. To retain the ability to grow obliges a person to cultivate, among other things, what Dewey variously calls "traits" of individual method (1997, pp. 173-179), "moral traits" (1997, pp. 356-357), or "personal attitudes" toward thinking and acting in the world (Dewey, 1933, pp. 29-34). These attitudes include what Dewey calls straightforwardness, open-mindedness, breadth of outlook, integrity of purpose, and responsibility. They position a person to develop an interest in learning from all of his or her contacts in the world, whether the latter be weighty or light, momentary or enduring, pleasant or trying. Dewey calls this posture "the essential moral interest" (1997, p. 360). That interest fuels the possibility of a flourishing life for individual and society alike.

Dewey believes teachers can play a central role in helping students develop "the essential moral interest." But teachers cannot do so directly, as if they were magicians or wizards who could manipulate at will other peoples' minds, hearts, and spirits. Here is where the other aspect of Dewey's philosophical anthropology that I mentioned comes into play, namely, his view of how a person can influence others.

The Centrality of the Environment

"There is not, in fact," Dewey argues, "any such thing as the direct influence of one human being on another, apart from use of the physical environment as an intermediary" (1997, p. 28). The educational consequence of this claim, Dewey writes, is that

> the only way in which adults consciously control the kind of education which the immature get is by controlling the environment in which they act, and hence think and feel. We never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment.

> Whether we permit chance environments to do the work, or whether we design environments for the purpose makes a great difference. And any environment is a chance environment so far as its educative influence is concerned unless it has been deliberately regulated with reference to its educative effect. (1997, pp. 18-19)

For Dewey, a school or classroom environment that is left up to chance is as likely as not to be mis-educative as educative. A chance environment is a random environment, a casual environment, and, in many respects, a thoughtless environment. Such an environment renders human outcomes a toss-up between the better and the worse, the helpful and the harmful, the good and the bad.

Dewey's argument does not imply paternalism. The opposite of a chance or random environment is neither a predictable environment nor one in which conduct is prescribed. According to Dewey, the right response to the dangers of leaving the environment entirely up to fate is not to go to the opposite extreme of trying to blueprint each and every aspect of classroom interaction. Such a project would bring any meaningful notion of growth, on the part of students and teachers alike, to a close. Moreover, the attempt to blueprint a classroom environment overlooks the rationale behind the claim that teachers cannot educate students directly. That claim highlights the fact that teachers cannot literally reach inside students' minds and hearts and either implant knowledge or, metaphorically speaking, rearrange the internal wiring such that students see the world in a new way. There can be no such direct, mechanistic impact of a teacher on a student -- and thank heavens for that, one wants to say -- at least if we are talking about experience and learning, rather than about brute behavior. For Dewey, the environment constitutes the intermediary, the medium, the means of educative influence. The environment, not the

teacher directly or unmediatedly, generates the stimuli which provoke the human responses and actions that Dewey characterizes as growth. The environment supports, or hinders, the cultivation of qualities of open-mindedness, responsibility, seriousness of purpose, and others that he associates with developing "the essential moral interest."

The concept of a stimulus, in Dewey's analysis, is not behaviorist. The latter point of view presumes a dualism, which Dewey rejects, between stimulus and response (for background, see, e.g., Alexander, 1987; Bowers, 1987; Bredo, 1998; and Tiles, 1988). Dewey's conception of the environment raises dynamic pedagogical questions about the meaning of a genuine educational stimulus. It calls attention to how a teacher can foster an environment that gives rise to the right kind of opportunities and invitations, those that lead to thinking, experience, and growth, rather than to their opposites.

Dewey's concept of a stimulus is interactive, or, better perhaps, "transactive," a term that highlights organic relations between people and their environment (cf. Dewey & Bentley, 1949). Things, objects, events, <u>become</u> stimuli by virtue of what persons are already doing. "Stimuli from the environment," Dewey (1989) writes,

> are highly important factors in conduct. But they are not important as causes, as generators of action. For the organism is already active, and stimuli themselves arise and are experienced only in the course of action. The painful heat of an object stimulates the hand to withdraw but the heat was experienced in the course of reaching and exploring. The function of a stimulus is -- as the case just cited illustrates -- to <u>change the direction of an action</u> already going on. Similarly, a response to a stimulus is not the beginning of activity; it is a <u>change</u>, a shift, of activity in response to the change in conditions indicated by a stimulus. (pp. 289-

290, emphasis in original)

People can provoke the very stimuli to which they respond. Their responses can engender new stimuli. Moreover, they can infuse intelligence, purpose, feeling, and hope into this transactive process. From Dewey's perspective, the organic relation between stimulus and response underscores why a teacher is morally obligated to think long and hard about the educational environment. I return to this point shortly.

Characteristics of an Educational Environment

As we have seen, when Dewey speaks of controlling, regulating, and designing an environment, he means something different than leaving the whole business up to chance, on the one hand, and employing top-down prescriptions, on the other hand. What kind of environment does Dewey propose teachers strive to bring into being in their classrooms? How does an environment in the classroom materialize in the first place? What should teachers pay attention to in shaping an environment? What should they actually do?

Although Dewey consistently rejects any notion of a blueprint for practice, he does believe the educational environment should feature several characteristics. The content of the characteristics will evolve and shift, especially as teachers and students mature in their intellectual and moral outlooks. But the form which the characteristics take endures. Dewey summarizes his sense of form in arguing that the educational environment should be simplified, purified, balanced, and steadying (1997, pp. 20-22; here he focuses on the school, but I believe the analysis pertains as much to his view of the classroom).

A "simplified" environment, not to be confused with a simplistic one, features objects "which are fairly fundamental and capable of being responded to by the young" (p.

20). By "fundamental," Dewey has in mind, for example, drawing students into an experiment on how to convert a liquid into gas, and allowing them to think out loud with concepts such as solid, liquid, and gas, rather than restricting them to a diet of extended, abstract lectures on the topic. A simplified environment embodies respect for students' present capacities and present powers, albeit with an eye on extending them.

A "purified" environment, not to be confused with a pure one, calls out participants' best thinking, feeling, and conduct, rather than encouraging them to intensify their biases, intolerance, dogmatism, and the like. It draws out students' open-mindedness rather than stubbornness, their willingness to listen to others rather than to rush to judgment, and so forth. A purified environment features activities and exchanges which fuel the emergence of moral dispositions, understandings and outlooks that support, rather than threaten or undermine, human flourishing.

A "balanced" educational environment sponsors individual development while also fueling a social and moral consciousness. In surveying the educational scene in urban America, Dewey writes that the "intermingling in the school [and classroom] of youth of different races, differing religions, and unlike customs creates for all a new and broader environment" (1997, p. 21). That environment can balance students' individual interests, as well as their family-centered and community-centered outlooks, with what Dewey calls an emerging "horizon" that takes seriously the perspectives, knowledge, and activities of others. With teachers' guidance and insight, students can pursue their own educational adventures while also interacting with others in ways that widen and deepen social sympathies (1997, pp. 121, 148).

Finally, a "steadying" environment invites students to harmonize their knowledge,

insight, feeling, and viewpoints, rather than assuming that life is supposed to be divided up into domains (school, family, work, play) that have nothing to do with one another. Posed differently, from Dewey's perspective the educational environment should help students to "coordinate" (1997, p. 22) their understandings and dispositions. A steadying environment assists the young in seeing their lives as a whole, against the broadest possible backdrop of human activity and aspiration.

According to Dewey, a simplified, purified, balanced, and steadying environment helps constitute conditions in which a teacher can best educate students. But the teacher must take the lead in bringing such an environment into being. "The young live in some environment whether we intend it or not," Dewey argues (1974a),

> and this environment is constantly interacting with what children and youth bring to it, and the result is the shaping of their interests, minds and character -- either educatively or mis-educatively. If the professed educator abdicates his responsibility for judging and selecting the kind of environment that his best understanding leads him to think will be conducive to growth, then the young are left at the mercy of all the unorganized and casual forces of the modern social environment that inevitably play upon them as long as they live. (p. 9)

Many educators and social critics have underscored that some of those forces are hostile to human flourishing: violence, anti-intellectualism, intolerance, bigotry, rampant consumerism, and more. For Dewey, an educational environment should fuel the kind of teaching and learning that enables people not only to resist such forces, but to generate humane and empowering forms of life. The teacher needs to have a grasp both of the negative forces and of possible, and positive, alternatives.

In short, Dewey's conception of the environment intensifies the complexity and the demands good teaching makes on the people who occupy the role (cf. Cuffaro, 1995; Fishman & McCarthy, 1998; Garrison, 1997; Greene, 1989; Schwab, 1978). According to Dewey, the teacher must be, among other things, knowledgeable in subject matter, mindful of the broad social significance of education, and committed to what he calls soul-study, a term that stands for a kind of permanent, always deepening intellectual and moral attentiveness to students. These attributes are requisite for having a sense for what it means to simplify, purify, balance, and steady the educational environment. The fact that the teacher constitutes the decisive factor in the environment means that the person in the role is crucial. As implied above, the person's knowledge, open-mindedness, determination, pedagogical ability, insight into human development, moral sensibility, and more, all come to the fore.

Dewey (1974b) argues that we cannot expect teachers to develop these moral and intellectual powers on the basis of formal education and of educational theory alone, crucial as they are. He implies that what we can and should expect, in both teacher candidates and teachers, is <u>movement</u> toward such qualities. A striking feature of Dewey's conception is that if teachers regulate or control the classroom environment in the manner he articulates, they will be constantly educating themselves. They, too, will be influenced indirectly by the very environment they strive to bring into being. They will be influenced by their students, whose minds and spirits, ideally, will be energized by the environment. They will be influenced by all the many steps that are part of shaping a meaningful environment, because taking those steps calls on teachers to be thoughtful, resourceful, perceptive, attentive, and more. <u>This process means continuously developing and</u>

extending those very qualities in themselves. Thus, the environment that the teacher strives to shape can serve not only students' learning, but also the teacher's growth as a human being. This outlook obliges the teacher to regard him- or herself as a dynamic element of the environment. The teacher does not stand apart from the process, as if he or she operated as an Olympian source of knowledge and insight. At one and the same time, the teacher is a technician skilled in the arts that help shape an environment, a participant in that very process who learns continually from students and from their interactions with subject matter and with one another, and a being-in-the-making influenced morally and intellectually by the environment.

These conclusions cohere with Dewey's fundamental claim about human influence: that it can never occur unmediatedly. Just as teachers cannot influence or teach students directly, apart from the environment, so they cannot directly "make" themselves capable of good practice. Teachers cannot render themselves more knowledgeable, attentive, skillful in instruction, and so forth, apart from an environment. They develop these qualities through their interaction in the environment, with students, with subject matter, and with whatever other books, materials, ideas, and, last but not least, human beings (e.g., colleagues), whom they engage.

Environment and Surroundings

Dewey shows that teachers can contribute further to their students' growth, and to their own, by making use of a distinction he draws between environment and what he calls "surroundings." According to Dewey, we are surrounded by a veritable infinity of things: sunshine, blue sky, night, clouds, insects, buildings, rooms, trees, street litter, electrical

outlets, windows, cars, shops, etc. But these surroundings do not constitute the environment that serves as the medium of influence of one person on another. Rather, the environment pertains to what Dewey calls the "continuity" between the surroundings and what he calls peoples' "active tendencies" (1997, p. 11). It is not everything around us, but rather the things with which we "vary" that form our "genuine environment" (p. 11). The color I have painted my apartment walls, the interactions I have with my neighborhood dry cleaner, and the shape of my dentist's chair, do not form part of the environment emergent in my classroom, even though they are always part of my larger surroundings. They are best understood, perhaps, as part of the environment in my home, at the dry cleaner's, or in my dentist's office. As Dewey argues, the environment in the classroom has to do with its physical features, with the materials employed in it, with the use of time, and, above all, with the innumerable contacts between the classroom's occupants. Those are the things with which teacher and students, taken as a whole, "vary." They make it possible to form, as Alan Ryan (1998) puts it in his remarks on Dewey, a "network of meanings" (p. 399). We might say that a good teacher makes explicit in her thinking, in her planning, and in her conduct, as many features of the environment as possible. A poor or unsuccessful teacher perhaps lets too many features, interactions, and more, recede into the category of surroundings, with the result that the classroom environment becomes unnecessarily impoverished.

What about individual meetings between a teacher and student elsewhere -- say, in the school hallway, on a playground, at a social gathering, in a faculty office, at a conference, or on an airplane? Teachers cannot control or regulate the environment at a conference in a far distant town, nor the environment on an airplane, nor the environment

at a school celebration, in a school hallway, or in a school cafeteria. And yet we know that such contacts are often influential on students, and indeed can become memorable. Do these facts challenge the notion that educators do not influence their students apart from the medium of the environment?

Two responses come to mind. First, all of the out-of-classroom settings described above feature environments. A teacher may have limited power to control or regulate them, but a case could be made that such environments influence the teacher's impact on students when in those settings. They variously shape, constrain, or facilitate particular kinds of communication. Many teachers, for example, alter their talk in some way or another, however subtly, when standing together with students in a museum as contrasted with discussing a poem or a scientific experiment in the classroom. That fact calls to mind why all of us, whether as children or as adults, say things like "Let's sit down here" or "Is this a good time to talk?" or "Let's wait until we won't be distracted." We want to create the right kind of environment. The point is that the environment, for Dewey, remains an ever-present intermediary or medium for one person's influence on another.

A second and perhaps more compelling response centers on the emergent quality of an environment. Consider the following scenario, which I base on what I have experienced time and again. I coordinate a graduate secondary teacher education program at my university. As part of my duties, I chair our admissions to the program. One day in June, I meet for the first time a recently admitted teacher candidate. This is two months before she will start taking courses with us, including a course that I teach. In normal parlance, one would say that we do not know each other when we first meet. We are starting from scratch, so to speak. However, an environment that will condition our interaction has

already begun to take shape even before she first walks through my office door. She does not walk in cold. She has read and perhaps heard various things about our program, including about its faculty. She has taken the time and the trouble to fill out and send in an application, and then to accept our offer of admission. And these steps may presuppose a great deal of thought on her part about becoming a teacher. Moreover, perhaps she has tutored, coached, or in other ways worked with adolescents. All of this gives her a particular character, sensibility, and bearing toward the world.

On my part, I have read her application. I have seen her grade transcripts, her letters of reference that have talked about her as a person, and her goal statement about why she wants to become a high school teacher. In reading these materials, I form a picture of her, one juxtaposed with the aims of the course she will be taking with me soon, as well as with the aims of the teacher preparation program in which that course is embedded. My reading comes on top of my own career as an educator. These factors contribute to the layers of expectation, curiosity, and hope that I bring to reading her application. In short, an environment, in Dewey's sense of that term, has begun to take shape even before the candidate and I meet in person. This environment is generated by a particular set of acts and intentions which pivot, in one way or another, around teaching and teacher education. It is the intermediary or medium for whatever impact I might have on the candidate, and vice versa, at our first meeting.

Four months go by. The course I teach has met a half-dozen times. The candidate, now a student in the class, has heard a great deal from me, and I have heard a great deal from her. Our class has begun to form an environment. One afternoon, the candidate comes to my office to discuss a paper she turned in on which I wrote some comments and

questions. A half-hour later she leaves, while stating "I'm clearer now about what I was trying to say." In everyday terms, one might say (speaking generously) that I had a good influence on the student. But it was not a direct, unmediated influence of one context-less mind upon another. Whatever help I rendered the candidate was predicated on everything we had done in our class up to then, and before as well, as I argued in the previous paragraphs. The environment has been the medium. That environment has taken shape as the consequence of a series of events through which meaning has been accruing. And the environment, I hope, has not been a chance or random one. I have brought to it whatever initiative and thought I am capable of mustering. The teacher candidate has brought to it her own initiative and thought, for she has clearly not been passive or merely reactive. These points show that while the environment serves as an intermediary of influence, the environment depends upon the agency, intentions, and actions of individual persons. The example also illustrates why teachers might ponder the impact on the classroom environment of individual meetings they hold with students in hallways, offices, homes, over electronic mail, or on the telephone. All such meetings can be perceived as parts of a whole, rather than as unrelated to the formation of a classroom environment supportive of teaching and learning.

A Focus on Activity, not on Learning

A related consequence of regarding the environment as the intermediary of influence is that teachers should be chary about focusing directly on student learning. At first glance, such advice may sound strange. What else, after all, should teachers attend to? But the logic of the claim follows on the heels of what I have said thus far about the role of

the environment. Dewey clarifies the point: "When the parent or teacher has provided the conditions which stimulate thinking and has taken a sympathetic attitude toward the activities of the learner by entering into a common or conjoint experience, all has been done which a second party can do to instigate learning" (1997, p. 160). Dewey writes of adults providing conditions, of adopting a sympathetic attitude, and of participating. He says nothing about their "instigating learning" in a direct, head-on manner. He regards student engagement, involvement, engrossment, but not learning per se, as the immediate aim of teaching. If teachers cultivate and support conditions that engage students in an activity, whether it be interpreting a poem, conducting an experiment, or debating the causes of an historical event, learning will more likely be the outcome, or so Dewey suggests. But if teachers try to force learning without taking steps to engender meaningful involvement, they may frustrate students and themselves. "Under normal conditions," Dewey contends, "learning is a product and reward of occupation with subject matter" (1997, p. 169).

For example, I cannot say that I "learned" at precisely 10:43 a. m. on a September morning in history class that World War I had multiple causes. A teacher may have sent those words into my ears at that time, but learning is not identical with hearing something. If I have truly learned, that learning has emerged over time, however long or short. It has derived from immersing myself, to some meaningful degree, in activities such as reading, talking with others, listening to my teacher, and writing about the war. In short, good teachers, Dewey argues, "give the pupils something to do, not something to learn; and the doing is of such a nature as to demand thinking, or the intentional noting of connections; learning naturally results" (p. 154). But if teachers try to focus directly on learning, rather

than on the conditions and intentional activities in the environment that foster learning, they are liable to make their students and themselves self-conscious. "Frontal attacks are even more wasteful in learning than in war," Dewey cautions (p. 169).

The idea of focusing indirectly on learning does not lessen the intensity or the integrity of the focus. It constitutes the mirror image of not focusing directly on oneself, as teacher. From Dewey's perspective on the environment, the teacher need not strain to be the fount of all knowledge and insight. All teachers need excellent preparation in whatever subjects they will teach. However, to recall Dewey's dynamic conception of the self, teachers also need to "lose" and "find" themselves" (1997, p. 126) in the classroom environment, just as their students hopefully do. That process means, as emphasized previously, that the environment teachers promote should be the kind which calls out certain responses in them as much as in their students. The environment should direct teachers to work straightforwardly at what they do, to be open-minded in the critical sense of that term, to sustain integrity of purpose even if we are talking about activities of only a minute's duration, and to cultivate their sense of responsibility, of believing in the worth of what they do and standing behind it, albeit in a spirit of learning as the other qualities suggest. Past successes as a teacher should provoke questions and thought, not complacency. "It is not enough," Dewey reminds us, "that certain materials and methods have proved effective with other individuals at other times. There must be a reason for thinking that they will function in generating an experience that has educative quality with particular individuals at a particular time" (1963, p. 46). When Dewey writes of undertaking steps to "generate" educative experiences for students, he once again turns our attention to the environment.

Conclusion: Dynamics of an Environment for Teaching and Learning

According to Dewey, educators are not social engineers who should seek to manipulate directly other people. Teachers are not gods who can, unmediatedly, bestow knowledge, insight, and new outlooks on students. All teaching, Dewey contends, occurs through the medium or intermediary of the environment that obtains in the school and classroom. In order to support the possibility of human flourishing, teachers need to think long and hard about the environment in which they work.

As we have seen, for Dewey the environment should be simplified, purified, balanced, and steadying. It should feature activities that engage and engross teacher and students alike. The teacher's vision should be directed not at self but at the classroom world before him or her. Rather than zeroing in directly on learning, the teacher can best promote learning by working out situations that draw on and extend students' knowledge, insight, curiosity, questions, and more. "The immediate and direct concern of an educator," Dewey (1963) concludes, is

> . . . with the situations in which interaction takes place. The individual, who enters as a factor into it, is what he is at a given time. It is the other factor, that of objective conditions, which lies to some extent within the possibility of regulation by the educator. . . [T]he phrase "objective conditions" covers a wide range. It includes what is done by the educator and the way in which it is done, not only words spoken but the tone of the voice in which they are spoken. It includes equipment, books, apparatus, toys, games played. It includes the materials with which an individual interacts, and, most important of all, the total social set-up of the situations in which a person is engaged. (p. 45)

Dewey highlights the interaction between teacher and students, what he calls the "total social set-up" of the situations that unfold in the environment. Because that set-up is dynamic, the environment itself is ever-changing. It is never established in a terminal way. The educational environment changes along with the persons embedded in it. And that includes the teacher, who helps show the way throughout.

Dewey's perspective on the environment remains timely for teachers and teacher educators. However, because of the complexity of Dewey's outlook -- and because of how complex it reveals good teaching to be -- teacher educators will want to provide candidates ample opportunity to study and to test it in practice. Teacher educators will also want to supplement Dewey's powerful conception with other readings and activities that take candidates into the nuances of how to shape an environment for teaching and learning. These readings and activities might also help candidates understand and anticipate the emotional, intellectual, and moral intricacy of the whole process. The "anxiety of influence" comes to the fore here (to paraphrase Harold Bloom [1973]). That is, teachers cannot always know for sure just how well or how poorly they are performing. They cannot always know what kind of influence they are having on their students. They cannot always determine what kind of influence their students are having on them. And, because of its dynamic nature, they can rarely have a clear grasp, at any given time, on what kind of environment obtains in their classrooms. Consequently, an appropriate last word on Dewey's view of the educational environment is that it requires considerable faith in human possibilities. Perhaps this outcome is how things must be, at least if teachers are to operate with imagination rather than with blueprints.

References

Alexander, T. M. (1987). John Dewey's theory of art, experience and nature: The horizons of feeling. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bloom, H. (1973). The anxiety of influence: A theory of poetry. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowers, C. A. (1987). Elements of a post-liberal theory of education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bredo, E. (1998). Evolution, psychology, and John Dewey's critique of the reflex arc concept. Elementary School Journal **98** (no. 5), 447-466.

Cuffaro, H. K. (1995). Experimenting with the world: John Dewey and the early childhood classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. New York: D. C. Heath & Co.

Dewey, J. (1963). Experience and education. New York: Macmillan. (Original work published in 1938.)

Dewey, J. (1974a). The need for a philosophy of education. In R. D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 3-14). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1934.)

Dewey, J. (1974b). The relation of theory to practice in education. In R. D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 313-338). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1904.)

Dewey, J. (1989). Theory of the moral life. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), John Dewey, The Later Works 1925-1953, Volume 7: Ethics (pp. 159-310). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published in 1932.)

Dewey, J. (1997). Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press. (Original work published in 1916.)

Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. (1949). Knowing and the known. Boston: Beacon Press.

Fishman, S. M. & McCarthy, L. (1998). John Dewey and the challenge of classroom practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Garrison, J. (1997). Dewey and eros: Wisdom and desire in the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, M. (1989). The teacher in John Dewey's works. In P. W. Jackson & S. Haroutunian-Gordon (Eds.), From Socrates to software: The teacher as text and the text as teacher: 89th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (pp. 24-35). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, A. (1998). Deweyan pragmatism and American education. In A. O. Rorty (Ed.), Philosophers on education: New historical perspectives (pp. 394-410). London: Routledge.

Schwab, J. J. (1978). The 'impossible' role of the teacher in progressive education. In I. Westbury & N. J. Wilkof (Eds.), Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Selected essay by Joseph J. Schwab (pp. 167-183). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tiles, J. E. (1988). Dewey. London: Routledge.